

App. No. 10/659,919  
Office Action Dated August 8, 2005

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 8, and 15 are hereby amended. As the features in the amended claims already have been considered, the revisions do not create new issues and this Amendment should be entered.

The amendments of claims 1 and 8 are supported by Figure 1 and page 8, lines 19-20. The amendment of claim 15 is supported by the subject matter of claim 1.

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, and 12-14 were rejected as being anticipated by Chan (US 6,588,673). Applicant traverses this rejection. Chan does not disclose a system for remote personalization and issuance of identity documents including a local controller for entering locally collected data to the portable personalization machine, where the local controller is external to the portable personalization machine, as required by claims 1 and 8. Nor does Chan disclose a control unit integrated within a portable personalization machine that both communicates to a remote controlling authority and to a local controller provided external to the portable personalization machine.

In Figure 2C, Chan discloses a PC (122) of a P3 processing system (120) that is provided for advance preparation of data provided by a card issuer system (110, the rejection equates to the remote controlling authority). In Figure 3, if the PC (310) included in the integrated card personalization system (300) is considered to be equivalent to the claimed control unit, then Figure 3 cannot be considered to disclose the local controller provided externally to the portable personalization machine required by claims 1 and 8.

Since Chan does not disclose each of the elements required by claims 1 and 8, the reference cannot be considered to anticipate the current invention. Favorable reconsideration of claims 1, 2, 5-9, and 12-14 is requested.

App. No. 10/659,919  
Office Action Dated August 8, 2005

Claims 3, 4, 10, 11, and 15-19 were rejected as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Bade (US 6,778,837). Applicant traverses this rejection. Claims 3 and 4 should be considered allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, from which they depend. Claims 10 and 11 should be considered allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 8, from which they depend. Bade does not remedy the previously noted deficiencies of Chan. Applicant is not conceding the correctness of the rejection as applied to the rejected claims.

Claim 15 recites a method of controlling a portable personalization machine including inputting local operator authorization via a local controller provided externally to the personalization machine, and controlling both the receiving of the local operator authorization and sending of the enable request by a control unit integrated within the personalization machine. Chan does not disclose the use of a local controller external to a personalization machine, and a control unit integrated within the personalization machine as recited in claim 15. There is no disclosure in Chan that local operator authorization is input via a local controller external to the personalization machine, or that the receiving of a local operator authorization and sending of an enable request is controlled by a control unit integrated within the personalization machine.

Bade is characterized as disclosing a mobile device that is accessed based on positional data, which in the rejection appears to be equated to an enable request as recited in claim 15. Bade is directed to non-analogous art, and there would be no reason for a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Chan and Bade. Further, Bade does not disclose that local operator authorization is input via a local controller external to the personalization machine, or that the receiving of a local operator authorization and sending of an enable request is controlled by a control unit integrated within the personalization machine.

Therefore, claim 15 is patentable over Chan and Bade. Favorable reconsideration of claims 3, 4, 10, 11, and 15-19 is requested.

Claims 20 and 21 were rejected as being unpatentable over Chan, in view of Bade, and further in view of Tushie (US 6,014,748). Applicant traverses this rejection. Claims 20 and 21 should be considered allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 15, from which they

App. No. 10/659,919  
Office Action Dated August 8, 2005

depend. Tushie does not remedy the previously noted deficiencies of Chan and Bade. Applicant is not conceding the correctness of the rejection as applied to the rejected claims. Favorable reconsideration of claims 20 and 21 is requested.


In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, James A. Larson, Reg. No. 40,443, at (612) 455-3805.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: November 8, 2005



JAL:mfe

  
James A. Larson  
Reg. No.: 40,443  
Hamre, Schumann, Mueller & Larson, P.C.  
225 South Sixth Street  
Suite 2650  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
612.455.3800